

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 SINCO TECHNOLOGIES PTE LTD.,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 SINCO ELECTRONICS (DONGGUAN)  
11 CO. LTD., et al.,  
12 Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-05517-EMC](#)

**ORDER RE WRITTEN DISCOVERY  
DESIGNATIONS**

Docket Nos. 493, 514

14  
15 This order addresses the objections made to written discovery designations.

16 **I. PLAINTIFF'S WRITTEN DISCOVERYDESIGNATIONS (DOCKET NO. 493)**

17 A. XingKe

18 1. RFA Set 1

19 • RFA No. 15. The objection is overruled. Although the RFA implicitly relates to SinCoo,  
20 nothing about the RFA or response ties XingKe to SinCoo.

21 • RFA No. 19. The objection is overruled. With respect to Defendants' MIL No. 2, the  
22 Court's main concern was to exclude agency adjudications of XingKe's applications.

23 • RFA No. 28. The objection is sustained in light of SinCo's agreement not to seek liability  
24 based on SinCoo.

25 • RFA No. 38. The objection is sustained. See above.

26 • RFA No. 48.3. The objection is sustained. The Court already addressed the alleged forged  
27 signature of Xu Shugong in ruling on Defendants' MIL No. 2.

28 • RFA No. 42. The objection is sustained. The Court excluded agency adjudications in

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

**ruling on Defendants' MIL No. 2.**

- RFA No. 44. The objection is sustained. See above.

## 2. Rog Set 1

- Rog No. 9. The Court expects the parties to resolve the completeness objection.
- Rog No. 12. The Court expects the parties to resolve the completeness objection

B. Mr. Tjoa

## 1. RFA Set 1

- RFA No. 11. The objection is sustained. The parties have stipulated that trademark applications were filed for “SinCo.” Whether XingKe currently has a trademark registration for “SinCo” essentially gets into the issue of agency adjudications.
- RFA No. 12. The objection is sustained. The parties have stipulated that trademark applications have been filed for “XingKe.” Whether there is currently a registration for “XingKe” essentially gets into the issue of agency adjudications.

## 2. RFA Set 2

- RFA No. 62. The objection is overruled. The Court has allowed evidence that XingKe filed trademark applications for “XingKe.”
- RFA No. 81. The objection is sustained. This appears to be related to the alleged forgery of Xu Shugong’s signature, which the Court has excluded.

### 3. Rog Set 1 (Amended)

- Rog No. 4. The Court expects the parties to resolve the completeness objection.

**II. DEFENDANTS' WRITTEN DISCOVERY DESIGNATIONS (DOCKET NO. 514)**

The Court addresses first general objections raised by SinCo.

SinCo's general objection that the abandonment of the SinCo mark in China would not mean abandonment worldwide (including the United States) is overruled. The Court has already held that simply because action took place in China does not mean that it cannot have consequences in the United States.

To the extent SinCo has made a general objection based on completeness, the Court expects the parties to resolve the completeness issue.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

- A. RFA
  - RFA No. 7. The objections are overruled.
  - RFA No. 8. The objections are overruled.
  - RFA No. 9. The objections are overruled.
  - RFA No. 130. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.
  - RFA No. 131. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.
  - RFA No. 132. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.
  - RFA No. 133. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.
  - RFA No. 134. The objections (see Docket No. 477-9) are overruled.
- B. Rog
  - Rog No. 5. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 12. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 13. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 16. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 17. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 18. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 19. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 20. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 21. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 22. The objections are overruled.
  - Rog No. 23. The objections are overruled.
- C. RFA (Amended)
  - RFA No. 5. The objections are overruled.
  - RFA No. 6. The objections are overruled.
  - RFA No. 142. The objections are overruled.
  - RFA No. 143. The objections are overruled.
  - RFA No. 144. The objections are overruled.

1 D. Rog (Amended)

2 • Rog No. 15. The objections are overruled.

3  
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5  
6 Dated: October 29, 2021

7  
8   
9 EDWARD M. CHEN  
10 United States District Judge